

ANTICHRIST VNMASKED,

In three Treatises.

The first,

AN ANSWER unto two PæDO-
BAPTISTS, D. FEATLY,
and M. MARSHALL.

The second Edition.

The second, &c.

THE MAN OF SINNE disco-
vered in DOCTRINE.

The third Edition.

The third,

THE DRAG-NET of the Kingdome
of HEAVEN: Or, CHRIST
Drawing all MEN,

The first Edition.

By HEN. DENNE, a Servant of
the CHURCH.

ISA. 58. 1.

Cris aloud, spare not, &c.

Reprinted at London, and are to be sold
among the Stationers. 1646.

ANTHROPOLOGY

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM



THE MUSEUM OF

THE BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM

OF THE

BRITISH MUSEUM



To the Church of G O D,

Grace, Mercie, and Peace, &c.

B Rethren, beloved in the Lord: when the providence of our God had brought me a prisoner unto London, it came to passe, that almost as soon as I came into Prison, there appeared a Book intituled, *The Dipper Dipt, &c.* which when I had seen, I did presently hold my selfe in dutie engaged to defend the Truth, against the Adversarie. The Booke of what temper it is, you know: But, *non licet nobis esse tam disertis*, we may not give rayling for rayling; we have not so learned *Christ*. The Booke is great, yet we found the whole strength of it to lye in ten Arguments, which are brought for the justification of *Childrens Baptisme*. I shall let all other things passe, as unworthy of an Answer, and addresse my selfe unto the answer of these onely. I did proffer to dispute the ten Argu-

THE EPISTLE.

ments with him face to face, the first whereof we did debate, & account thereof is given. That we went no farther, this is the reason : Some worshipfull Gentlemen desiring to heare, I was very willing; but the Doctor would not admit of them, without an Order frō the State; but would only debate the matter in private, and not in presence of (only) foure auditors. And whilst these things were thus in debate, I received a Message from him by the mouth of a brother, that if I would write, he would defend his Arguments. I have now written as briefly as I could, and yet as largely as the time would permit.

I have joyned with him M. *Marshalls* Book concerning the *Baptisme of Infants*, which I had taken into my hands to examine, whilst I was a prisoner in *Cambridge* : and now finding these two to joyn together in this one thing, & to use for the most part the same Arguments, I have joyned them in the Answer. As for their Replies unto our Objections, I meddle not with, but leave thē to others:
it

THE EPISTLE.

it wil be a sufficient task for me, to shew that their building is upon the sand. I present this Treatise unto you, desiring your favourable correction, if in any thing I have swerved from the truth. If you should be pleased to command my Pen further, unto this, or unto another more weighty subject; which calls for all our labours, viz. That the efficacie & extent of Christs death may appeare unto the world, which yet in great part lyes hidden and obscure; I shall be willing to stoop unto your command herein, and endeavour to become your servant in the Lords work: provided, that you all assist me with a plentiful stream of your prayers, that wisdome may be given unto me, that so great a work may be carryed and managed by the power of the Spirit of GOD, that gain-sayers may have their mouthes for ever stopped. Brethren farewell. *The grace of our Lord Iesus Christ be with you all. Amen.*

From Prison in the
Lord Peters house,
Feb. 22. 1644.

*He that is most un-
worthy the name of
a Brother,*

HEN. DENNE.



TO the READER.

READER, I perceived the last Impression of the two first Treatises to be much inquired after, and not to be found; I have therefore re-printed them, to answer the expectation of those who desired to read them. Concerning the second, I have this to say: The Title is, The Man of Sinne discovered; and indeed, the Booke hath in some part performed what it promised: For I have heard many Presbyters confesse, That if the Doctrine therein contained be true, that then they both are and have beene Limbes of Antichrist, that Man of Sinne. And yet, although the Booke intituled the Gangreen, doth crie out against this Treatise, accusing both it and the Author of abominable Heresies; upon better considerations, it hath since beene approved by some of them, and the second Edition Licensed for the Presse: Not that the Author doth desire Truth to be weighed by the approbation of men; first reade, and then judge: Notwithstanding, the Author seeth many things in it to be something obscure, which he promiseth to cleare in another Treatise more fully, so soone as he shall be able.

To the Reader.

I have added unto these a third Treatise, of the same Authors, intituled, The Drag-Net of the Kingdome of Heaven; or, Christ drawing all men; wherein the freenesse and fulnesse of the grace of God is in some part manifested. This is the Copie of a Sermon preached not long since at Cambridge; at the preaching whereof, the young P. incensed with some kind of zeale, did stirre up the Committee for the Countie, who forthwith issued forth their Warrant, to apprehend the Author: who being brought before them, and his Accusers present; when nothing worthy of Bonds, or Imprisonment, was brought against him, yet were there some who would needs have had him committed for his boldnesse, to preach under their Noses; so hatefull is the smell of Truth to them: And in conclusion, he could not be discharged, unlesse he would enter into Bond, to become his owne Accuser, by bringing in a Copie of his Sermon unto them; which he accordingly did. I intreat thee (good Reader) to consider, whether the Libertie of the Subject be not here in a high measure violated; An Arbitrarie Power (against a poore man) with a high hand exercised, and a High-Commission practise by this Committee revived: so that the Spirits which were cast out of those Spirituall Courts, seeme not as yet to have departed our Coasts. I doe not declare this by heare-say, but as an eye and eare-witnesse of what was done,
being

To the Reader.

being amongst many others present, whilst these things were in agitation: And I have now here given thee a true Copie (so farre as I am able) of what was then delivered, penned by one who was present. And hereby thou mayest see, to what height the Spirit of Persecution is likely to grow: unlesse the God of Heaven shall put into the hearts of those unto whom the Axe is committed, to lay it to the Root of this over-spreading Tree, that it may be cut downe, never to grow up againe; That the tender-Consciences of the people of our God may no longer be burthened, and that their bodies may be freed from violence and oppression.

The Lord fill us with the Spirit of Grace and Supplications, that we may not cease to sollicite the Throne of Grace, that he would send forth Labourers into his Harvest.

L AU 59

THE



THE
PÆDO-BAPTISTS:

DAN. FEATLY, D.D.

AND

STEPHEN MARSHALL, B.D.

Oppugned:

*Their Arguments Opened, and
Answered.*



When the Woman cloathed *Rev. 12.*
with the Sunne, having the
Moone under her feet, and
a Crowne of twelve Stars
upon her head, cryed tra-
vailing in birth, ready to be
delivered, Behold a wonder in Heaven, *A*
great red Dragon having seven heads, and
ten hornes, and seven Crownes upon his heads:
And his Tayle drew the third part of the
Stars of Heaven, and cast them to the earth:
And the Dragon stood before the woman,
B which

which was ready to be delivered, to devour her child, when she had brought it forth.

Never was the *Church of Christ* in travaile, ready to be delivered, of any truth formed in her wombe, but as ready is that *ten horned Dragon* to devour the fruit. When the Church travailed in paine, ready to be delivered, and to bring forth the *Doctrine of Justification* in *Martin Luthers* dayes; we see *Cardinall Cajetan* in speciall, and the rest of the *Scarlet Conclave*, ready to swallow up both Mother and Issue, had not the Providence of **G**od carryed the defenders of Truth upon *Eagles wings*; and mightily defended them.

Our owne experience teacheth us in these our dayes, wherein the shadowes begin to vanish, and the night to passe away, and the *Sun* of righteousness to draw near unto our *Horizon*; how many adversaries doe now besirre themselves with policy and force, to keep us (if it were possible) in perpetuall darknesse, and to hinder the rising of the Sun in our hearts.

Among the rest, the Church is now travelling, ready to be delivered, and to bring forth the *Doctrine of the Baptisme of Water*, raked up heretofore in an imitation of *Pseudo-baptisme*: The truth of the Ordinance
and

and Institution of the Lord Jesus, lying covered with Custome and Practice, and a pretended face of Antiquitie. The Lord hath beene pleased at this day, to put into the hearts and tongues of some, to stand up in the defence of his truth, (against the *daring Face of Error*) who doe now labour ready to be delivered. But we see how many Champions ready armed, are come forth with *reviling speeches*, and *rayling accusations*, to dash the countenance of this new-born babe: and if this will not, to execute *Imprisonment* on the one hand, and *wish and threaten Banishment*; or worse on the other hand, unto those that shall dare to uphold or maintaine, that which in conscience they are perswaded to be the truth.

Amongst the multitude of opposers, I shall single out two, with whom I will adventure to encounter, to trie the strength of their Weapons, and force of their Armes, though I fight upon very unequal termes.

The first, is *D. Featly*, (my fellow Prisoner) though not for the like Cause; who setteth on us with great might: As the *Red Dragon* hath *ten hornes*, so hath he *ten severall Arguments*, whereby as with so many *hornes*, he pussheth at the Truth, to throw it

downe to the ground, and to set up his long practised Baptisme of Infants.

The second, is *M. Marshall*: The sound of whose name is enough to strike terror to a *Prisoner*; who commeth forth more like a Lambe then the other, and hath *two Hornes*, or Arguments, wherewith he seeketh to strengthen himselfe, and to weaken his Adversaries. These twaine, though the appearance of them be farre different, yet is their voyce the same: though he pretend but two, he useth indeed most of the other. I shall observe their owne method, and first set downe the state of the Question, and then weigh their Arguments in the Ballance as they lye in order.

The state of the Question set downe by *D. Fea*ly is this, page 39.

The children of such parents who professe Christian Religion, and are members of the visible Church, sith they are comprised within Gods Covenant made to the faithfull Children of Abraham, and their seed, may and ought to receive the Scale of that Covenant, which was Circumcision under the Law, but now is Baptisme.

The state of the Question in *M. Marshall*, page 3.

Whether the Infants of such as were, or might

might have beene stiled Beleevers and Saints in the Apostles dayes, and writings, are to be admitted to the Sacrament of Baptisme?

Unto this state of the Question layd thus downe by these two, I shall not speake any thing of the difference that I doe believe is betweene them; lest I should seeme rather to be contentious, then to search after the truth: Onely I shall desire, that the cunning craftinesse of men may be a little discovered.

Are not these the men, who have without any scruples, for many yeares together, Baptized, or caused to be Baptized all Infants, of any parents whatsoever? And now being to justify their practise in the face of the world, doe state the Question, Whether the Infants of Saints are to be baptized? I must tell you plainly, the *state of your Question* is not of the same latitude with your *Practise*, but too narrow for it. What, are all the Parents in *Lambeth*, *Acton*, *Finchingsfield*, become Saints now? Not any couple of them unbeleevers? Will you now begin to sowe Pillowes under the Arme-holes of your Parishioners? Will you now begin to say of them, as those Conspirators did of the people, *Numb. 16.3.*

All the Congregation is holy, every one of them, and the Lord is among them?

Let me speak unto you the Parishioners, and Inhabitants of these places: Have you not sometimes heard from their Pulpits such words as these; That *most of you are in a damnable estate and condition?* That there are not ten of you *have the knowledge of God, or his Sonne Jesus Christ?* And yet now, in the state of this Question, ye are *Saints, Beleevers, visible Members of a Church, &c.* Surely, what dealing is this? If you did appeare to them so to be, they did ill to give you such language: but if you were indeed other persons, and did appeare unto them otherwise, they did evill to *Baptize your Infants.* But I will say no more of the state of the Question: Now follow the Arguments.

ARGUMENT I. 39.

D. Feat-
ly.

That which extends to all Nations, belongeth to children as well as men: for children are a great part, if not the halfe of all Nations.

But Christs command of Baptizing, extendeth to all Nations, Matth. 28. 19. Goe therefore teach all Nations, Baptizing them. And Mark. 16. 15. Preach the Gospel to every creature:

creature: he that beleeueth, and is Baptized, shall be saved.

Ergo, Christs command of Baptizing belongeth to children, and they ought to be Baptized as well as men.

Page 38. We know, that in every Nation *M. Mar-*
the children make a great part of the Nation, shall.
and are alwayes included, under every administration to the Nation; whether promises, or threatnings; priviledges, or burthens; mercies, or judgements; unlesse they be excepted.

Thus farre it seemes, that these two speake, both by one and the same Spirit; the Argument in both of them being one and the same. And how mightie soever, and invincible soever, this Argument seemeth, it will be found lighter then vanitie, being full of deceit, and falsehood; neither of the Propositions being true. For the first, it is plainly denyed: For something may extend to all Nations, which doth not belong to every particular person in the Nation, nor yet unto every condition of men in the Nation. For it is written, Gen. 22. 18. In thy seed shall all the Nations of the earth be blessed. Now would not this be strange reasoning? That which extends it selfe to all Nations, must needs extend it selfe to

the halfe, or greater part of the Nations. But the blessing in the seed of *Abraham* extends it selfe to all Nations.

Therefore the blessing extends it selfe to the halfe, or greater part of the Nations.

If this be granted, see what will follow. They that live and dye in unbelieve, are one halfe of the Nations; nay, nine tens of the Nations: Therefore the blessing which extends it selfe to all Nations, must needs (by this reasoning) extend it selfe to those that live and dye in unbelieve; who are by farre the greater part of the Nations. Thus should we argue contrary to the Scripture, which saith, that *Abraham is the Father of them that believe*, *Rom. 4. 11.* And they which are of Faith, are blessed with faithfull *Abraham*, *Gal. 3. 9.* Thus is the falsehood of this Proposition discovered.

Bur *M. Marshall*, (who is the subtillest of the twaine) layeth us downe a Proposition something varying in words, but ayming at the same marke: to wit, *That Children are alwayes included under every administration to the Nation, unlesse they be excepted.*

Is it possible that *M. Marshall*s understanding, or at least his tongue, should thus range from the truth? and that in the Pulpit?

pit? and in a Lecture appoynted by the *Honourable House of Commons*, in a Sermon premeditated, penned, Printed, and published? Surely, how doth it behooove us to take heed, both what, and how, and whom we heare? How dangerous a Rock is it to build upon man, or the son of man, subject to so many infirmities, passions, and errors? O poore soules, how oft are you hurried into grosse and palpable errors? having your soules posselt with an over-weening conceit of the fidelitie, truth, and sinceritie of man. When a *Monk* brought a poysoned Cup to King *John*, he dranke his death deeply without any suspicion at all. For as was the superstition of those dayes, 'who would have deemed poyson to have been mingled, in a Cup presented and tasted by a holy *Monk*? I say therefore againe, Take heed, and beware what you heare. But you will say, what is the matter? where is the false-hood?

Doth not he say, That every administration to the Nation includeth Children, unlesse they be excepted?

First, is not the preaching of the word of the Gospel an administration of God? to a Nation, to all Nations, to every Creature? *Mark. 16.* Yet Doctor *Fearly* hath granted unto

unto me in a Conference, that it doth not extend it selfe unto little Children in the Cradle, of three or foure dayes old. And yet are they not in expresse termes excluded?

Secondly, was not the *Passcover* a Nationall administration to the people of the *Jews*, and children of nine dayes old no where excepted from eating the *Passcover*? and yet it pleaseth *M. Marshall* to deny that children did eat the *passcover*, pag. 52. I speak not this, because I believe little children did not eate of the *passcover*, but that I may wound *Goliath* with his owne sword.

Thirdly, he that beleeveth not shall be damned, and children are not excepted.

Fourthly, is not the breaking of bread a Nationall administration, as he is pleased to call it? But where can he prove that children are any where excepted from the Lords Supper, rather than from baptisme? For in that he saith, pag. 5. *That infants are capable of the grace of baptisme we are sure, not sure that they are capable of the grace signified and sealed in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper.* How is this; doth baptisme sea'e one grace, and the Lords Supper another? so he will make us beleeve, but it is not yet proved.

One is our birth, and the other our food, he saith; but these are but words without weight.

Let us see whether the grace sealed in both be not the same: what doth baptisme hold out unto us? Remission of sins, *Act. 2. 38.* Be baptised unto Remission of sins.

John preached the baptisme of repentance unto remission of sins, *Mark. 1. 4.* Now doth not the Supper hold forth the same? *Mat. 26. 28.* *This is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for many, for remission of sins.* Let any man come forth, and shew me one grace held forth in the Supper, which is not held forth in Baptisme. Will he say, that children ought not to receive the Lords Supper? because it is said, *Let a man examine himselfe, &c.* We say, againe, that so it's said; *He that beleeveth and is baptised: and if thou beleevest with all thine heart, thou mayst:* If he say, this is meant of men of yeares; we say, the same of the other: So that it appeares, that children are no more excepted from one ordinance than another; being indeed equally excepted from both.

But if it were true, and granted, yet will not the argument hold, for we shall find children excepted. And therefore to the mi-

nor proposition of the argument, we say ; That the *command of baptizing*, doth not extend it selfe to all persons in or among the Nations, without any restriction, or exception ; for if so, the commission would reach all manner of persons whatsoever, as well unwilling, as willing, unbelievers, as beleevers, which none dare say. For if any Nation or Citie beleeveth not, no other Baptisme belongeth to them, than to have dust of the feet shaken off, for a testimony against them.

Againe, the Text readeth, *BAPTIZONTES AUTOUS*, *Mat. 28.* Baptizing them ; that is not *TA ETHNE*, the nations ; but *MATHETAS*, Disciples, which are included in the verbe *MATHETEUSATE*, teach ye, or make Disciples : And so we justifie that answer, which saith, that the *command of Christ* extends its selfe onely to those, who being capable, receive instruction, and are taught and made Disciples.

The Doctor seemes to take advantage from the word, *made Disciples* ; and frameth us this Argument.

They that are made disciples may be baptised.

But, Though Children in their nonage cannot be taught, yet they may be made Christs Disciples, by being admitted into his Schoole, their

their parents giving their names to Christ both for themselves and their families.

This is his saying ; and if you will believe him, you may ; if not, I know not who can blame you, for here is no prooffe of it. When as I had some conference with the Doctor, I did desire prooffe from him, That Children could in their nonage be made Disciples ; which he assayed thus to prove, and I did write it from his owne mouth, and read it in his presence.

I did first alledge, that Children could not be made Disciples, because it is written ; *Whosoever beareth not his Crosse, and followeth me, cannot be my Disciple, Luke 14. 27.*

His answer was, that this is meant of men and women, and not of Children ; which I easily grant, and I doe bring it for the same purpose, to prove, that Children cannot be made Disciples : which he assayed to prove thus.

All those whose names are given to Christ by their faithfull parents, and brought unto the Church, and received into the Church, and securitie given to be bred up in Christs school, are so far made Disciples, as is required of any, in their Infancie to be made Disciples.

But, Children have their Names given to Christ by their faithful parents, and are brought unto the Church, &c. There,

Therefore, *They are so farre made Disciples, as is required of any in their Infancie to be made Disciples without any exception, against many things in this Argument, worthie of exception. I doe answer, by granting the whole, namely, that Children are so farre made Disciples, as is required of any in their Infancie to be made Disciples, that is nothing at all; and so, not to be Baptized at all. This is the period, and end of this weightie Argument.*

But *M. Marshall* sets upon us with greater waight, to prove that Children may be made and called Disciples, from *Acts 15. 10. Now therefore why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the necks of the Disciples.*

I reason thus, saith he, page 39.

All they upon whose necks those false Teachers would have put the yoke of Circumcision, are called Disciples, and to be called Disciples.

But they would have put the Circumcision upon Infants as well as growne men.

Therefore *Infants as well as growne men, are called Disciples, and to be called so.*

The *Major* (saith he) is undenyable: the *Minor* I prove thus, as you shall see at large, page 39.

Good Sir, spare your labour of proving the

the *Minor*, for that we doe grant as undeniable: but we boldly denie the *Major*, and cannot but be a little amazed, that you should have your sight so dimme, to thinke it undeniable.

You say, *That all they upon whose neck the yoke was to be put, were called Disciples.* This is but your saying, and we may not beleieve it; for the Text sayth not so, which is alledged. All that can be proved out of the Text is this, that they would have put a *yoke upon the necks of all the Disciples*; not that all were *Disciples* upon whom they would have put the *yoke*; or that they would have put the *yoke* onely upon the *Disciples*: I thinke this may be called perverting of Propositions, rather then converting; see but your error: All men living were once in *Noah's Arke*; All that were in *Noah's Arke* were men living.

The *Blew Regiment* was slaine in such a fight; All that were slaine in such a fight, were of the *Blew Regiment*: this is your arguing.

False Teachers put a *yoke* upon the neck of the *Disciples*; All were *Disciples*, that false Teachers put a *yoke* upon: which if it were so, not onely Children, (who were

were to be Circumcised after the manner of *Moses*) must be called *Disciples*, but also *Servants*, of what age soever, whether beleevers or unbeleevers, must be called *Disciples*; For all *Servants* bought with *Money* must needs be circumcised, *Gen. 17. 13.*

Let a stranger circumcise all the males that belong unto him, *Exod. 12. 14.*

Servants are then to be called *Disciples* as well as *Children*: but more of this anon. If I had not found this under *M. Marshals* name, I should never have given credit to any report of it. Sure it is, that if you deale thus with us often, we shall hardly believe you when you tell us the truth.

There is one thing more we must take notice of in the *Doctors* reply, That in *Christs* precept, *Teaching* doth not goe before, but follow *Baptizing*, *Mat. 28. 20. Teaching them to observe all things, &c.*

Answ. This indeed doth prove, *Teaching* followes *Baptizing*; but it doth not prove, that it did not goe before. I wonder wee heare not of that, *Marke 1. 4. John did Baptize and Preach*; which is alledged by some: but the answer is the same, that this proves no more, but that he preached after he baptized; not, that he preached not before. And no man questions, but that as *Preaching*

ing goes before Baptisme, so also it ought to follow : Which Order is well laid down, *Heb. 6. 1.* What is to be preached before the administration of Baptisme, *viz. Repentance from dead workes, and faith towards God, the doctrine of Baptismes.* And what is to be preached after, *viz. Laying on of hands, resurrection from the dead, eternall judgement ; and so on to perfection.*

Other things there are worthy of exception in the Doctors Reply ; but wee leave them to their proper place in the following Arguments. Thus have wee done with the first Argument, which comes forth like a forlorn hope : and what the event of it hath beene, I leave to thy censure. I will now goe forward, by the assistance of God, to grapple with the second Argument, one horn being broken, so that it is dreadfull no longer.

ARGUMENT II.

None ought to exclude the children of the faithfull out of the Kingdome of Heaven.

But by denying them Baptisme (as much as in us lyeth) we exclude them out of the Kingdome of Heaven : For as Christ affirmed to Nicodemus, and confirmed it with a double oath, or most vehement asseveration, Amen, Amen, or verily, verily, I say unto thee,

except a man be borne of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdome of heaven. *Ergo, We cannot deny them Baptisme.*

M. Marshall is so wary, as not to make use of this Argument at all, unlesse he seem to dip his finger into it in his first Use of Application, pag. 52. where he hath these words: First, it serves for just reproofe of the *Anabaptists*, and all such as by their rash and bloody sentence, condemne Infants as out of the state of grace.

And unlesse it be lawfull for us to alledge the testimony of *Ireneus*, cited by M. Marshall, pag. 4.

The words are cited in *Latin*, (I beleeve he was ashamed to English them) they beare this sence; *Christ came to save all through himselfe*, (I say all) *that are borne againe through him into God, infants, little ones, and Children.* And by the word *borne againe*, according to the *Glossers* Interpretation, is meant, *Baptized*. Where the *Glosser*, cited by M. Marshall, joynes with D. Featly, in the meaning of the word *borne againe*. But I may not strictly lay this unto M. Marshall's charge, because he himselfe hath disclaimed it.

In this Argument I have not any adversary

sary besides the Doctor, though many have written of the same subject of Baptisme of late.

For answer unto this Argument, I would we might understand what the Doctor meaneth by the words *Kingdome of Heaven*. Which word is sometimes taken for the visible Church on earth, as for the preaching of the Gospell, as *Mut. 13*. If by *Kingdome of Heaven* in the Argument, this sense be held forth; then we deny the major, and say, that Children are to be excluded from the Kingdome of Heaven, as not being capable of membership in a visible Church, being incapable of hearing, with understanding, the sound of the Gospel.

Secondly, sometimes the word *Kingdom* is taken for the manifestation of God unto the soules of men, as *Rom. 14. 17*. *The Kingdome of God is righteousness and peace, and joy in the holy Ghost. And the Kingdom of God is within you, Luk. 17. 21*.

In this second acception, children are also excluded the *Kingdome of Heaven*, that is, incapable of discerning either good or evill, and of receiving the manifestations and Apprehensions of God in the soule.

Thirdly, by *Kingdome of Heaven*, may be understood, grace, mercy, and favour of

God. And this is the sense in which we imagine the Doctor taketh the word *Kingdom*. And being taken in this sense, we deny the *minor* proposition, and say, that by denying them Baptisme, we doe not at all exclude infants from the Kingdome of Heaven; but we say, that Children are as free from sinne, as fully in the favour and grace of God before Baptisme, as after. This seemes a strange paradox to the Doctor, who hath not yet learned the art of forgetfulnesse to bury his old lesson. *For as much* as this child is regenerated and borne againe of Water, &c.

For to strengthen the assertion; it is alledged which is written, *Joh. 3. 5. Except a man be borne againe of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of Heaven.*

Ans. If we understand the word *Kingdome* in the third sense, for the grace, mercy, and favour of God, revealed in *Jesus Christ*: What will be more strange than the sense that is brought unto us? *viz.* That unlesse a man be baptised, there is no entrance into grace, favour, mercy, no remission of sins, &c. Which how contrary unto sound Doctrine it is, will appeare: In that the Scripture, which setteth out unto

us the qualifications of those that are to be baptised, doth require faith, *Act. 8. 37. If thou beleevest with all thy heart, thou mayst.* VVhere it is plaine, that faith (whose object is remission of sins in *Iesus Christ*) is required in persons to be baptised. Peradventure the Doctor will say, this is meant of men of yeares of discretion, and not of children: If he shall so say, I demand, what reason he had to find fault with his adversary? that unto that place in the 3. of *Iob. 5.* did answer in these words: The words of our Saviour concerne men in riper yeares, and not children. This the Doctor cannot beare in another, yet he will now beare with it in himselfe, as he did before unto that place before alleadged, *Luk. 14. 27.*

Secondly, suppose this be meant of men of yeares of discretion, it is the Doctors owne grant, that Christ prescribes the remedy to them, as well as men, *pag. 44. l. m. 1.* But he doth not prescribe this as a remedy to men, (who are required to beleeve remission of sins before Baptisme) therefore not unto children: unlesse it be more effectually unto children then unto men. To speake my thoughts of this Argument, I shall discover the ground-worke upon which it is built: namely, upon these Propositions.

First, *That Baptisme* was ordained to take away the filth of sinne.

Secondly, *That Children* before their Baptisme, are defiled with sin; as well, (he should rather have said, as ill) as men.

Thirdly, *That Children* after Baptisme are washed from sinne.

This is the man that did pretend to write *Romes Ruine*: Yet see how he dawbeth with *Romes Truall*, and with her untempered mortar. See I pray you, how he plougheth with *Romes Heifer*. I will challenge the *Iesuites*, to produce me if they can, more foundation rayfing errors than these.

To the first, that Baptisme doth not take away the filth of sinne: That which takes away the filth of sinne, *justifies*.

But *Baptisme* doth not *justify*. Therefore it doth not take away the filth of sinne.

Again, if the *blood of Christ* have taken away all sinne, then there remaineth none for *Baptisme* to take away. If any remaine for *Baptisme* to take away, then hath not the blood of *Christ* taken away all sinne.

Now that the blood of *Christ* hath taken away all sinne that ever shall be taken away, we have the Scriptures to witnesse, *Ioh. 1. Behold the Lamb of God that taketh away the sinne of the world.* 1 *Pet. 2. 24. Who him-*

self

self tooke away our sins, in his owne body upon the Tree. By whose stripes ye are healed.

Now what is this, but to deny *Christ* comming in the flesh? to deny his propitiation and attonement.

Now unto the second Proposition: That children before their *Baptisme* are defiled with the guilt of sinne.

¶ We grant, that they are so indeed by nature. Which is the thing that the Doctor labours to prove, which we do not deny. He should have proved, that they cannot be by any meanes justified by the grace of God from that Transgression, whereof they stand guiltie by nature before *Baptisme*. Yet it is worth the observation, how like himselfe he is in his prooffe: for he reasoneth thus, pag. 44. *All that are sentenced to death are guiltie of sinne. But children are sentenced to death, for they dye: therefore they are guiltie of sinne.*

Is it possible a Doctor should reason no better? What could he have done more against himselfe? He saith, *All that are sentenced to death are guiltie of sinne.* Surely, then his sprinkled Infants are not yet cleansed, but the guilt of sin remaineth on them: for many of them dye immediately after their sprinkling, if not three quarters dead before.

This is against his third Proposition.

Againe, If all that are sentenced to death are guiltie of sinne; then is not the Doctor yet purged from his old finnes by his owne confession, the *Messengers of death* having already summoned him to appeare. Nay, then, did not the Apostle speake truth, when he said, *Rev. 1. 5. Who hath loved us, and washed us from our finnes in his blood.* What shall we say? that the wise are taken in their owne craftinesse? that the Lord hath put out the right eye of the Prophets and Priests; and hath sent them strong delusions, that they should believe a lye.

But before I leave this Argument, I deem it necessary, to give you the meaning of the Text which is wrestled by the Doctor; *Except a man be borne againe of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdome of Heaven.*

I did make bold to tell the Doctor to his face, that the *Protestants* doe not understand this Text of *Baptisme*. Which thing he confessed, and said; that the *Protestants*, out of their zeale against the *Papists*; did goe too farre on the right hand in the meaning of the Text. Now how farre he hath wandered on the left hand; let all be judge.

Cardinall Bellarmine confesseth, that the Protestants doe not make use of this Text, as not acknowledging a necessitie of Baptisme unto salvation, which this Text seemeth to hold forth.

All the difficultie of the Text will be resolved, when we shall rightly understand what it is to be borne againe of water. Which all men know to be a metaphoricall speech, and therefore we must consider the mind of the speaker. To be borne againe of water, is to be partaker of the Invisible, and spirituall washing from sin by Jesus Christ. *If I wash thee not, thou shalt have no part with me, Joh. 13. 8. Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his blood, Rev. 1. 5.*

These are they that come out of great Tribulations, and have washed their Robes in the blood of the Lamb, Rev. 7. 14.

But it will be said, that this is a blood-washing, not a water-washing.

I answer, That there are two things considerable in Scripture.

First, the washing, or taking away of sin.

Secondly, the manifestation of this washing unto the Conscience. Both these, but especially the latter, are set out in Scripture under the metaphor of water, *Ezek. 36.*

35. I will sprinkle cleane water upon you, and cleanse

cleansse you from, &c. Joh. 4. 10. He would have given thee living water, vers. 14. Whosoever shall drinke of the water that I shall give him, shall never thirst: but the water that I shall give him, shall be in him a well of water, springing up into everlasting life. Now, what is this water save the word of promises, conveyed unto the soule by the spirit? Joh. 6. 38. He that beleeveth on me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water: This spake he of the spirit: Promise is water, and spirit is water. To be borne of water is to be borne of the Word. Being borne againe, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the word of God, which liveth and abideth for ever, 1 Pet. 1. 23. To be borne of the spirit; is to have the spirit ministred to the soule, by the hearing of faith, Gal. 3. 2 Cor. 3. whereby the soule is sealed to the day of Redemption. Thus much in brieffe to declare the meaning of this place, to cleare it from the cloudy glosse, which the Papists in the first place, and the Doctor in the next, have put upon it. The sense then of the Text is no more but this: He that beleeveth not, shall be damned: which the Doctor must grant onely to be spoken of men of riper yeares, unlesse he will condemne all infants to destruction. Thus much

much for the second Argument, wherein the Doctor is engaged alone. The third follows :

ARGUMENT III. pag.44.

They whom the Apostles Baptized, are not to be excluded from Baptisme : for what the Apostles did in their ministeriall function, they undoubtedly did either by Christs command, or by the direction of the holy Spirit, wherewith they were infallibly assisted. **D. Fear-ly.**

But the Apostles Baptized Children : for they Baptized whole families, whereof Children were a knowne part.

Ergo, Children ought not to be excluded from Baptisme.

The Gospel takes place, just as the Law, by bringing in whole families together : When Abraham was taken in ; his whole family was taken in with him. When any of the Gentiles turned Profelytes, ordinarily their families came in with them : So in this new administration, usually if the Master of the house turned Christian, his whole family came in, and are Baptized with him. **40.**

Ans^r. I cannot but commend the modestie of Bellarmin, who bringing in this Argument, confesseth, that it concludeth only probably, and nothing certain, because no

man

man is able to prove, that there were any Children in these families.

Yet these men must have it granted them, otherwise they imagine we are not to be borne withall: For saith the Doctor, *It is no way credible, that in all these Families blessed by God, and converted to the Christian Faith, all the women should be barren, and not one fruitfull.* For answer, I say: First, the Doctor cannot prove, that there were any married women at all in these families. Secondly, suppose them to be all married, must they needs be barren, unless they had little children in the Cradle? Is it not possible that a man and woman may have seven children, or more, and yet the least of them be able to perceive the weaknesse of the Doctors reasoning, and able to confute it.

Concerning the six households baptized, we find but two of them that had their whole households Baptized: that is, *Cornelius*, Act. 11, 14. and *the Centurion*, Act. 16, 31. Now concerning the first of these: It is said, *Act. 10. 2. That he feared God with all his house*: And we read of no more Baptized, save they that received the holy Ghost, *vers. 47. Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the holy Ghost as well as we?* And we read of no more

more receiving the holy Ghost, save they which *heard the Word*: vers. 44. *The holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the Word.* Now all that were Baptized, feared God, heard the Word, received the holy Ghost, as well as the Apostles themselves. For the second whole household Baptized, which was the Goalers, Act. 16. we read, that they *take the Word to all that were in the house*, vers. 32. and *so his whole house believing in God rejoiced*, vers. 34. So that all that are here said to be Baptized, are said to hear the Word, believe and rejoyce. Now how any such should be a child in a Cradle, not able to discern good or evil, we are (as yet) not able to understand.

As for the other foure households, it is not said, that the whole households were Baptized; and therefore no need that the Sucklings should be excepted, if there had been any. First, because there was not as yet such a Doctor hatcht, who would imagine infants to be baptized. Secondly, the name of the whole being commonly taken for the greater part, sometimes for the better part; is also, sometimes for the worse part. Thirdly, the Doctor cannot imagine why the *Apostle* should not except Children, if they were not Baptized. I will intreat him, to give

give me leave to imagine the reason, and it shall be none other then the answer of the Lord to the Disciples, *Mat. 13. 13. Therefore speake I to them in Parables: Because they seeing, see not, and hearing, heare not, &c.* They that are wise shall understand, but the heart of this people is waxed grosse, and their eares are dull of hearing. The Doctor might as well have asked the question; if it were not the mind of Christ that children should be Baptized, why did he not in expresse termes say, Children shall not be Baptized, that so in a word the Controversie might have beene ended. I leave the the Answer of this question unto the prudent that are truely taught of God. As for others, they are not able to beare it.

I must now turne me unto M. Marshall, who tels us a very fair story, if it were true, that the gospel took place just as the Law, so that usually, if the Master of the family turned Christian, his whole family came in, &c.

Sure we read of six families, and no more, and that sometimes it is so, none can deny: we blesse God, we are able to shew the truth of it in our dayes, though rarely. But that this was, or is an usuall thing, is not true. Was not *Philemon* a Christian, and yet his servant *Onesimus* an unbeliever? Nay, was it not an ordinary case among the
Corinths,

Corinths, and eliewhere, that the husband was a beleever, and the wife an unbeleever? *1 Cor. 7. 14. The unbeleevving wife is sanctified by the hu band: And how knowest thou O man, whether thou shall save thy wife?* vers. 16. Nay, was it not an usuall case, that the father was a beleever, but the children unbeleever? the children beleever, but the father an unbeleever? otherwise, what meane these words? *Mat. 10. 21. The brother shall deliver up the brother, and the father the child: and children shall rise up against their parents, &c. vers. 35. I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother: and the daughter in law, against the mother in law; and a mans foes shall be they of his owne household, Mark. 13. 12. Children shall rise up against their parents, and cause them to be put to death.* All this notwithstanding, he is bold to affirme, that it was an usuall thing as of old, when the Master was Circumcised, all the family was Circumcised. For when the Master or father of the family was baptized, all the whole family followed. I wonder men of learning and gravitie, are not ashamed of such arguing as this. This Argument seemes so light unto me, and lyeth open unto many absurdities, more then I either

either have, or will speake of: that surely in my judgement, it is not worthy of a further answer.

But men that have no better weapons, must be contented to bring forth such as they have. I will now hasten unto the fourth Argument, in these words: pag. 45.

D. Feat-
ly.

Such as were Circumcised under the Law, may and ought to be baptiz'd under the Gospel: for baptisme answereth to Circumcision, and is called by that name, Col. 2. 11. 12. The same grace is sealed unto us by the one, as by the other; to wit, mortification of the flesh, remission of sinnes, and admission into the visible Church. And the children of Christians are as capable of baptisme, as the children of the Jewes were of Circumcision. But children were Circumcised under the Law, Gen. 17. 12. 13.

Ergo, Children may, and ought to be baptiz'd under the Gospel.

The same command which enjoyned Abraham to seale his children with the seale of the Covenant, enjoynes us as strongly to seale ours with the seale of the Covenant; and that command of God, which expressly bound Abraham to seale his with the signe of circumcision, which was the sacrament then in force pro tempore, doth virtually bind us to seale ours with

with the seal of Baptisme; which is the Sacrament now in force, and succeeds in the roome of the other, by his owne appoyntment.

- Pag. 27. Be pleased to observe how plaine the Apostle makes it, that Baptisme succeeds in the roome, place and use, of circumcision, Col. 2. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

Here is very much spoken, and little proved; many intricate questions being herein involved, which would aske much labour to discusse.

First, Whether Baptisme come in the roome of circumcision? the prooffe alledged out of Col. 2. 8. doth prove Baptisme to succeed in the roome of circumcision, no more then 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21. doth prove Baptisme to come in the place of the Arke of Noah, which indeed M. Marshall will say: for he saith, Baptisme is the Arke to carry to Heaven, pag. 58. 11.

Secondly, Whether the same grace were sealed in Circumcision, which is sealed in Baptisme, neither more nor lesse? As first, whether something were not sealed in Circumcision, which is not sealed in Baptisme; viz. I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a stranger; all the Land of Canaan; for an everlasting possession, Gen. 17. 8.

D

Second-

Secondly, another *Quære* is; whether something be not sealed in Baptisme, which was not sealed to the *Jewes* in Circumcision? *viz.* Sinne already taken away, and transgression finished 1600 yeares agoe by the Messiah.

Thirdly, a third question; whether the Scripture will give us warrant, to call BAPTIZME a seale or not?

Thus you see, that which these men thinke so plaine, doth indeed fill the world with doubtfull controversies: But I shall shunne all these questions, and addresse my selfe unto the answer of the Argument: In which I deny the *Major*, and say, that they which were *uncircumcised* under the Law, may not be *Baptized* under the Gospel; neither doth the command of God, which bound the *Jew* to *circumcision*, bind us to *Baptisme*. This remaineth to be proved: For first of all,

The command of God, commanded all males to be *circumcised*, whether the parents beleaved or not. And this is more then any of both these undertakers dare affirme, that all Children should be baptised.

Secondly, the command of God required the many thousands of Israel to be Circumcised at the hill of fore-skinnes, when they were growne men, and bare
Armes,

Armes, yet we read of no profession of faith, *Jos. 5. 3.* It was enough to entitle any one unto circumcision, that he was of the loynes of *Abraham*: But this was not enough to entitle men to baptisme. Which the *Baptist* seemes to me, to confirme, when he reproves the Pharisees, *Mat. 23. 9.* And thinke to say within your selves, we have *Abraham* to our father: As if hee should have said, you thinke to claime right and priviledge unto Circumcision, for you and yours, because *Abraham* is your father: and indeed so you may. And now, because you have right to Circumcision, you imagine also, that upon the same ground, you have right to baptisme: I tell you nay, for this baptisme is the baptisme of repentance: *Bring forth therefore fruits meet for repentance.* You have hitherto lived under a Nationall Church, under carnall Ordinances, wherein the chaffe and the wheat have beene mingled together, without separation, and have seemed to enjoy the same priviledges and prerogatives under the carnall commandement. But now commeth one, whose fange is in his hand, and hee will thoroughly purge his Flowers, and gather the Wheat into his Garner, but the Chaffe will be burne with unquenchable fire.

Hitherto we have enjoyed common priviledges: You have all beene Circumcised, all eaten the Passeover, all brought your offerings to the Priests, without any distinction of chaffe from Wheat. But it shall not be so now: So that we see there is more qualifications required unto Baptisme, then were required unto Circumcision.

Thirdly, the command of God, required not onely Children to be circumcised, but also servants, as hath beene spoken before, *Gen. 17.* And when a *Profelyte* came in, he was bound, not onely to circumcise his *Children*, but all his *Servants*, *Exod. 12. 48.* So that if the command be in force for Children, it must needs be also in force for servants. So that if a Master be converted to the faith, and have an hundred servants, they must all be Baptized whether they will or no. Now, who will not blush at this? Let them see how they can escape this.

We must not let passe the dealing of these men, who will have the command to stretch, either wider or narrower, (like the Sea-mans hose) according to their pleasure. Sometimes they will not be tyed to the command, as in the circumstance of
time;

time; and yet they are not able to shew any reason why the circumstance should not tye them. And I would they would resolve us one question, how many dayes a child may be kept unbaptized without sinne?

Sometimes they will stretch beyond their command, as in baptizing Females. They will challenge as great a priviledge as may be, either to doe, or not to doe, at their pleasure.

And yet is the Argument of *Circumcision* the maine post and pillar upon which the whole Fabrick leaneth.

Fourthly, if the command of *Circumcision* be the rule of Baptisme, why should not the Passeeover be the rule of the Supper?

As among the Ancients, who did give the Lords Supper unto Children upon the same ground: And he hath no other shift to avoyd it, but by denyall, that Infants did eat the Passeeover. There is no such thing mentioned (saith he) in the Book of God.

But for that, we say, first the whole Family was to eat it, Exod. 12. And M. Marshall thinks it a sufficient ground that children were Baptized, because some Families

lies were Baptized. And shall it not be a sufficient ground that Children ate the Passeeover, when not a few, but all the Families of *Israel*, even the whole *Assembly of the Congregation* did eat it?

Unto this M. *Marshall* replyeth, pag. 40. that our Argument is not so strong as theirs, to prove Infants did eat the Passeeover.

They reason thus: *Some Families were Baptized.*

Therefore Children were Baptized.

We reason thus: *Not some onely, but all the Families of Israel did eat the Passeeover. Therefore Children did eat the Passeeover.*

The first of these reasons (as they think) is strong for them: Then why should not the second be stronger against them? No, they deny the consequence; Strange, what conceit will doe. But lest he should speake without reason, he will tell you why he denyeth the Consequence: Because no other Scripture shewes that the Passeeover doth belong to Infants. But we have other plain Scriptures, that baptisme is in the roome of Circumcision, pag. 41. First, the weaknesse of the reason is here plainly confest. Secondly, these Scriptures are not yet seen. Thirdly, if you could bring but such

Scrip-

Scripture for baptizing of Infants, as wee are able to bring for Infants eating the Passeeover, the Controversie would soone be ended.

First, all the Congregation of Israel did eat thereof. But by your confession, Infants of nine dayes old were admitted into the visible Church, and so admitted members of the Congregation.

Secondly, there was no barre (bodyly uncleannesse excepted) to keep any from the Passeeover, but uncircumcision only. *No uncircumcise a person shal eat thereof, Exod. 12. 48.*

Thirdly, it was the command of God; *Three times of the yeare shall all the males appeare before the Lord, Exod. 23. 17. Thrice in the yeare shall all your men children appeare before the Lord, 34. 23.* That the Feast of the Passeeover was once of this thrice, appeareth, as by the fore-cited places, so also, *Deut. 16. 1.* unto the end of the eighth verse, as also is manifest by example, *Luk. 2. 41. His parents went to Jerusalem every yeare at the feast of the Passeeover.* I am certaine, that if our opposites had but thus much for the Baptisme of Infants, that wee have for Infants eating the Passeeover, they would clap their hands and cry, *vicinus.* Let them see in

the meane time, the strength, or rather weakenesse of their own great Argument, which indeed produceth all the rest. For I will be bold to say, that take this Argument of Circumcision away, and you shall take all away.

But suppose we should grant, if Baptisme came in the roome of Circumcision, that the same, and no other grace is sealed in the one then in the other: Yet will it not follow that *Children* should be Baptized; because there being a change of the Ordinance, and a vanishing of it away, we are not to looke back unto the old, that is vanished away, but unto the command which instituteth the new: It is the command by which we must be guided, lest he that is the Judge of all, say unto us, as unto the *superstitious Scribes and Pharisees*, *In vain doe they worship me, teaching for Doctrine the tradition of men*, Mat. 15. 6. And *who hath required these things at your hands?* But unto this they reply, That we have no command for giving the Supper to *Women*, or for Baptizing of *Women*, as some have said, (whom for honour sake I will not name) that we have no example for Baptizing of *Women*: so farre had they forgotten themselves, and erred, not know-

ing the Scriptures. D. Featlies words are these; *They can produce no expresse particular command, either for the Baptizing of women, or administring the Lords Supper to them, pag. 45.*

M. Ma shall is a little bolder in the one Ordinance then in the other. His words are these; *pag. 35. In the poynt of Sacraments, there is no expresse command, no example in all the new Testament, where women received the Sacrament of the Lords Supper. There is no expresse command, that the Children of beleivers, when they are growne, should be instructed and baptized, though instructed by their parents.*

What would these men have? would they impose upon us, that something may be added unto the worship of God, which is not at all found in Scripture by *command* or *example*? They dare not say so: How often shall we tell them, that if they bring us either *command* or *example*, by necessary consequence, we will beleve them?

First, *No command for Baptizing of Women*, saith the Doctor. But M. Marshall dare not say so. I pray what is that, *Mat. 28. 20. Make Disciples of all nations, baptizing them. Here is a command for baptizing beleiving Disciples.* Second-

Secondly, we have no command, saith the Doctor, no example, saith M. Marshall, that women received the Lords Supper. This was alledged against M. Latimer in Qu. Marias dayes, at the disputation holden at Oxford by the Popish crew: And it was then to their shame answered by the Martyr; That we had a command in the 1 Cor. II. 28. *Let a man examine himselfe.* The word in the Greek, is ANTHROPOS, & in their own vulgar Latin *Homo*, which signifies a man or woman. This answer of his, did so abash the Popish fry, that they had not wherewith to reply. But these men are not so easily daunted out of countenance, they cannot so easily blush: But in their conceit they are able to shift this. They confesse that the word signifies man or woman: Yet they say, though the word ANTHROPOS is a common name to both Sexes, yet the Apostle useth the masculine Article, *Ho*, not *He*; and *HEAUTON*, not *HEAUTEN*; and so there is no expresse command but for men. I wonder the Doctors face is not so red as his Scarlet Gowne, in bringing such a Criticisme in a matter of so great weight. You cannot be ignorant, that under the more worthy Gender, both Sexes are usually comprehended. The Church in
Act. I. 15.

D. Feat-
 ly, pag.
 73.

Act. 1. 15. are termed *Disciples*, in the masculine gender; and yet were *Women* amongst them, *vers.* 14. The *Apostles* write to *Saints*, *Brethren*, *Beloved*, all in the masculine gender: Therefore did he not write to any women? Thus the Doctor reasons, 1 *Ioh.* 5. 21. The *Apostle* saith, *Little Children keepe your selves from Idolls: Your selves*, in the Greek is masculine, though *Children* be *neuter*. Now by the Doctors *Logick*, *Women* are not here commanded to keepe from *Idolls*. Heb. 9. 27. *It is appoynted for men once to dye*: The word *Men*, is restrained to the Masculine, by the Article *To* *is*: Therefore this is not meant of women: It cannot be proved from hence that women must dye. *Doctor-like*. How long will you harden your faces? Are you not yet ashamed of these things? (my pen had almost written) *tricks*. *Psalme* 39. 6. *Surely every man walketh in a vaine shew: The heart of man is deceitfull*. Rom. 3. 10. *There is none righteous, no not one*. Gal. 3. 10. *Cursed is every one that continueth not, &c.* All these and a thousand more in the masculine gender: Doe these places exclude *Women*? The Doctor complains, they have taken away his *Books* and *Livings*: Surely, he that readeth this,

this, will suppose, he hath lost his reason, and his understanding also. To make an end of this Brabble, I pray consider, *Gen. 5. 2. Male and Female created he them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam.*

A third Proposition is layd downe by *M. Marshall*, pag. 45. That there is no expresse command, that the children of beleevers, when they are growne, should be instructed and Baptized, &c. I should as soone have beleaved, that the Rivers would have forgotten their course, and runne up the hils, as that such a thing should have flowne from *M. Marshalls* mouth. Thus are men smitten with blindness, and their right eye put out, when they fight against the truth of God. O Lord, thou art righteous in thy judgements: thou hast confounded the wise, and made their folly to appeare: Thou hast given them strong delusions, that they should beleeve a lye, because they have not beleaved thy Truth: Oh, our Father, out of the mouth of Babes hast thou perfected prayse: When the wise doe utter folly and deceit.

I shall bring no other thing against *M. Marshall*, but his owne words: Out of his owne mouth shall he be judged. His next words are these: *Expresse command there is, that*

that they should teach the *Heathen* and the *Jewes*, and make them *Disciples*, and then *Baptize* them. But no command, that the *Children of Beleevers* should be taught and baptized, &c. Why, are the *Children of Beleevers* neither *Jewes* nor *Gentiles*? They must be of one sort. For these two divide the whole world in Scripture, into *Jew*, or *Gentile*: the *Gentile* again being divided into *Greek* or *Barbarian*, *Heathen* and *Gentile* being but one in signification. The growne *Children of Beleevers*, are either *Jewes* or *Gentiles*, or else none of the world. But there is a command to *Baptize* all *Discipled Jewes* and *Gentiles*. Therefore all growne children of *Beleevers*, so soone as they shall be *Discipled*.

In the next place, to prove, that *they who were Circumcised may be Baptized*, is brought the reason and equity of the Law, which still remaineth.

I pray what reason can be shewed why the people should be *Circumcised* at all; but *onely the will and command of God*?

Again, what reason can be shewed why children should be *Circumcised*, from *Abraham to Christ*, rather then from *Adam to Abraham*? Here reason falters, faith and obedience takes place,

Yee

Yee are my friends, if you doe what soever I command you, Joh. 15. 14.

Againe, they say, If the Children of Christian parents should be excluded from Baptisme, they were in a worse condition then the Jewes under the Law.

I answer, it followeth not: that happinesse which they had by Circumcision under the Law, was called a *Yoke*, Acts 15. And M. Marshall confesseth, that it did oblige them to great expences, and long journeys. Yet if it should have beene a greater prerogative then it was, the consequence wil not hold: for who dare say, that the children and Infants of *Seth* were in a worse condition (in respect of salvation) then the children of *Abraham*? and yet they were neither Circumcised nor Baptized, and yet saved as well they, that were both Circumcised and Baptized. I will not dwell any longer upon the Answer of this fourth Argument, but goe on to consider the fifth.

ARGUMENT V.

They who are comprized within the Covenant, and are no where prohibited to receive the Seale thereof, may, and ought to receive it.

D. Feat-
ly, p. 46.

But Children are comprized within the Covenant

Covenant of faith, whereof Circumcision was a seale, Rom, 8. 11. And now Baptisme is,

Ergo, Children may and ought to receive Baptisme.

This is Master Marshalls first and great Argument, which he layeth downe in Rinne, thus:

The Infants of beleeving parents are ex-
derati, therefore they must be signati: They
are within the Covenant of Grace, belonging
to Christs body, Kingdome, and Family:
therefore are to partake of the Seale of his
Covenant, or the distinguishing badge, between
them who are under the Covenant of grace,
and them who are not.

M. Mar-
shall, pag-
8.

Answer. These two Arguments doe but
onely differ in word, but in substance they
are one and the same: Both of equall force,
or rather of like weaknesse. I shall addresse
my selfe to answer the Argument, as it is
layd downe by Master Marshall, because
in him it hath the greater weight; onely
I shall touch the Doctor by the way: and
first, I must observe the Doctors sleight, in
leaving out some words which ought to
have bin inserted in the second propo-
sition, viz. Children are comprized with-
in the Covenant of Faith. These words
ought to have beene added. And are no
where

where prohibited to receive the seale thereof. And then the minor Proposition shall be denied: Because an Institution of God, and an affirmative command doth usually forbid all things that are comprehended in the affirmative command, or which are beyond, or besides the Institution. Is it any where in Scripture forbidden, that the Doctor shall not Baptize his Bells after the Popish superstition? But if he should doe so, might it not be said, *Who hath required these things at your hands?* and might not the Lord justly challenge you with the breach of his command? *Adde not thou unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a lyar,* Prov. 30. 6. Thus will the Lord say, *I gave Commission to Baptize Beleevers, and ye have Baptized Children: In vain doe yee worship me.* To adde unto the Ordinance of God, hath seemed a slender fault sometimes. But surely in my conceits nothing can be more hideous: I confesse it is a foule fault to take any thing away, but a farre greater to adde. See Rev. 22. 18, 19. *If any man shall take away from the words of this Prophecie of this Booke, God shall take away his part of the Booke of life, &c.* A much heavier censure: But, *If any man shall adde unto the words of this Prophecie, God shall adde unto him all the plagues that are written in this Booke.*

are written in this Booke. A heavy censure : Therefore let this Doctor heare, and tremble ; thou hast transgressed his Commission, thou hast added to his words, *Repent therefore of this wickednesse, that if it be possible the thought of thy heart may be forgiven thee.* When a man commeth to a *vessell of Wine*, and taketh away many Gallons, yet that which remaineth is *Wine* still ; but if he shall adde but one Gallon of water, but a *dram* or two of poyson, the *Wine* remaineth no longer *Wine* : But *your Wine is mixt with water*, Isa. 1. 22. and there will be death found in a *poysoned Cup*. Take a homely comparison along with you : A Butcher hath two Customers in the Summer time, the *Waspe*, and the *Flesh-fly* ; the *Waspe* brings nothing with him, but takes some meat away : The *Fly* takes nothing away, but addeth unto that she finds. Now tell me, if the Butcher had not rather have seven *Waspes* in his shop then one *Flye*. Peradventure the *Doctor* may plead, he is no *Waspe* (yet we feel his sting) yet in this he shall never justifie himself frō being a *buzzing Flesh-fly* ; that hath done more harme by *addition*, then ever he could have done by *subtraction*. I leave the *Doctor*, to prove unto us the Proposition denyed.

E

And

And I addresse my selfe unto M. Marshalls great Argument, in shew like a *Weavers beame*: but when I have weighed it, I find it so light, that it is like the *Chaffe before the wind*, or like the *Thistle-downe before the whirlwind*; both of the Propositions being so false, that it appeares, the conclusion hath not any shew of truth. First, they that are in Covenant must be sealed. This is denied: For first, *women* among the *Jewes* were in Covenant, yet not sealed with *Circumcision*: His Reply is, that they were Circumcised in the Males: Very good, if Circumcision be a rule of *Baptisme*, let him shew us a reason, *why female children should not be baptized in the males*. But we adde; *male children* among the *Jewes* were in Covenant before they were eight dayes old, yet were they not Circumcised before they were eight dayes old, because God had set the eight day an expresse terme for *Circumcision*. And so hath God set an expresse time for Baptisme, viz. *The time of beleeving*.

Thirdly, we farther adde upon M. Marshalls owne grant, in his first conclusion That the *Covenant of grace* hath alwayes for substance beene one and the same: (In the prosecution whereof, many things are confuted)

fusedly spoken) If this be granted, then were the Children of the faithfull, from *Adam to Noah*, ten generations; from *Noah to Abraham*, ten generations; as well in Covenant as the Children of the faithfull now: Or else the Covenant was not one and the same. But, we see for twentie generations no Seale annexed unto Children in Covenant: And the reason is, because God had not commanded. And this is the reason now, why Baptisme is not to be applied unto Children, because God hath not commanded it so to be applied.

Fourthly, wee further adde, upon the grant of the third Conclusion, That ever since *Abrahams time*, God had a seale to be applied to such as enter into Covenant with him. This gives us to take into consideration, how Children of Beleevers are in Covenant more then the Children of unbelievers? We say, that it is one thing for God to enter into Covenant with the Creature, it is another thing for the Creature to enter into Covenant with God. For wee read of a Covenant made by God unto every living Creature, to Fowle, Cattell, and every beast of the earth, *Gen. 9. 10.* Here wee see, God enters into covenant with Beasts and Fowless, but they doe not reciprocally enter

into covenant with God againe. So that it is plaine, that God entring into Covenant with the creature, and the creature entring into Covenant with God, are two reall distinct things. Although it be granted him, that God hath entred into covenants with all beleivers children, yet it shall never be granted him, that they have entred into Covenant with God. We grant that Conclusion; that God hath a Seale, now to be applied to all that enter into Covenant with God. But this is the thing that should have beene proved, that children doe enter into Covenant with God. And yet all that he labours to prove, is, that God entred into Covenant with Children. God hath a Seale for all that Covenant with him, but not for all with whom he enters into Covenant.

The next thing to be taken into consideration, is; whether the Covenant of Gods grace belong any more to the children of beleivers then unbelievers? And, whether it doe truly belong to all the children of unbelievers; Or whether to some of one, and some of the other indifferently? If it belong to some of one, and some of the other indifferently, why doe they refuse to Baptize the one, when they Baptize the other? I could

could ave wished, that he had declared unto us what he had meant by the Covenant of grace, that he might have spared our labour. For he confesseth, that onely true beleevers are made partakers of the spirituall part of the Covenant, pag. 3. The *grace of God* is comprehended (so farre as we are able to comprehend) in these branches; the *grace of Election*, of *Vocation*, of *Justification*, of *Glorification*: I know not any other fruit of that love of God revealed in the new covenant, manifested unto the world by *Jesus*, the Mediator between God and man.

Did God give his Sonne *Jesus* to dye for the Children of Beleevers, and did he not give him to dye for the children of unbeleevers also? Otherwise, how could the Gentiles have beene taken into covenant? Hath God chosen all the Children of Beleevers? Why, then all of them shall be saved; for whom he did predestinate, them also he call'd, Rom. 8. Hath God chosen only the Children of Beleevers? Then shall none other be saved. But if he have chosen some of one, and some of the other, then doth the grace of *Election* belong to one as well as to another: The like may be said of *Vocation*, and *Justification*. We cannot see

how the children of beleevers should be rather justified then the children of unbeleevers. For, *by the obedience of one, the free gift came upon all men, unto justification of life, Rom. 5. 18.* Neither doe wee understand the part of the covenant of grace, which is not spirituall.

But it will be said, although our reason cannot fathom this, yet if so be that the Text alledged will hold forth what he hath affirmed, wee are bound to beleeve it. True; therefore in the next place, wee desire to ponder the Scripture, which he hath brought as a prop unto his opinion, *Acts 2. 38. 39. For the promise is unto you, and to your children, and to all that are a farre off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.* In a word, by this promise, I understand the knowledge of remission of sinnes, and life everlasting.

Now, who are the children that this promise is made unto? The Doctor will helpe us here a little (though against his will) for he confesseth, that *the promise to Abraham and his seed, was not to be understood of the seed according to the flesh: This he saith is contrary unto the Apostle, Rom. 4. 13. The promise that he should be the heir of the world, was not given to Abraham or his seed through*

the Law, but through the righteousness of faith, as he was the father of all the faithful. And to this purpose also this present Text, Acts 2. 38. is alledged, unto which he joyneth Gal. 3. 7. Know ye therefore, that they that are of faith, are the children of Abraham: Unto which also a reason is joyned, and yet applyed against reason by the Doctor, pag. 47. From this concession of the Doctors, we give an answer unto the other, thus: No beleever hath a larger copy or priviledge then Abraham had; but Abrahams copy (in respect of the eternall Covenant) did not belong to Abrahams seed after the flesh: Therefore the priviledges of beleivers belong not to their seed after the flesh, but after the spirit. If it be inquired, who are the seed of beleivers? it will be answered in the words of our Saviour, when it was told him, Mar. 3. 32. Behold thy Mother and thy brethren without seek thee; and he answered them saying, who is my Mother and my brethren? And he looked round about on them which sate about him, and said behold my Mother and my brethren, &c. It is said of Levi, that he said unto his father, & to his mother, I have not seen him, neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor know his own children. He that beleeveth & is baptized, the same is my Father, my Mother, my Brethren, my Sisters.

Thus we see, that the seed of beleevers is not to be reckoned according to the flesh.

But we will grant, that that place, in *Acts 2.38.* is meant of that seed which was according to the flesh: And we say, that the promise is extended no farther then the words of the Text, *even to as many as the Lord your God shall call.* For first, the promise is made to you, *upon calling; to them that are a farre off, upon calling; and therefore, unto their children also, upon calling: and no otherwise.* The Text is plaine.

But M. *Marshall* replyeth, that this had beene no comfort to tell them, that their children should be received in, if they did beleeve; for this was no better comfort, then might have beene preached to any *unbeleever.* I plainly see, that *Bernard* seeth not all things; and that M. *Marshall* misleth the scope of the Text, which I will endeavour to open, and then leave him to further consideration. When *Peter* had declared unto the *Jewes*, that they had taken, and by wicked hands crucified and slaine the Lord of life, *Acts 2: 23.* And that God raised up and made the same *Iesus* whom they crucified both Lord and Christ, vers. 36.

When

When they were convinced in their soules of this wickednesse, they were *pricked in their hearts*, and doe not say, *what shall we doe to be saved?* But as men in a most forlorne and desperate condition, out of all hope of salvation, either for their selves or their posteritie, they say, *Men and Brethren, what shall we doe?*

Let me lay open the heart of this people a little, that you may know and judge of their case. I suppose them thus to speake: Hath the Lord said indeed, *That every transgression and disobedience against that Law, delivered unto us at Sinai, in the hand of a Mediator, shall receive a just recompence of reward?* Then what tongue can expresse, what heart can conceive that recompence that is due unto us, who have not onely transgressed *Moses Law*, but have also crucified the *Lord of life*, flaine the *Mediator of the new Testament*, whom *God hath rayed up, and made Lord of all?* With what face can wee looke on him whom we have pierced? Tremble O Earth, and be astonished O Heavens, at our estate and condition; Hills fall upon us, Mountaines cover us: what shall we doe? This is our misery, and yet is not this all; for we well remember what was written
from

from the Trumpet of *Sinai* : *I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquitie of the Fathers upon the Children, unto the third or fourth generation, of them that hate me*, *Exod. 20. 5.* Will God indeed visit the transgression of his Law from *Sinai*, unto the third and fourth generation? Sure then, O cursed Children of most cursed Parents, shall not wee, and our Childrens children, be visited unto a thousand generations? O see, there is not any hope left, that either wee, or our children, or Childrens children, should ever be received unto mercie againe : Wee have crucified, wee have slaine the *Lord of Life*; and now, *Men and Brethren, what shall wee doe*? Now these things being thus, you shall see the *Plaster of Consolation* full as broad as the soare of *Desperation* : *Peter* speaketh words of comfort unto them, to this effect; If you, your children, or generations a farre off, shall repent, and be Baptized, fear it not, you shall not be excluded: for I declare unto you the promise to you, and to your children, and to all that are a farre off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call. Now let the Reader judge, whether the promise of taking in of their Children, upon Calling, were not a word of
great

great Consolation unto desperate and distracted Parents, who for the present could thinke no other thing, but that both they and their Children should be for ever damned?

Thus much for the exposition of this Text, and for the answer unto the fifth Argument.

Now followes the sixth Argument, layd downe by D. Featly, p. 47..

Such who were typically Baptized under the Law, are capable of reall and true Baptisme, under the Gospel: for the Argument holds good, a typo ad veritatem, from the type to the truth; from the signe in the Law, to the thing signified in the Gospel.

But, Children were typically Baptized under the Law; for they, with their Fathers, were under the Cloud, and passed through the Red Sea: But their washing with rain from the Cloud, prefigured our washing in Baptisme, and by the Spirit: And the Red Sea, in which Pharoah and his Host were drowned, was an embleme of Christs blood; in which all our ghostly enemies are drowned, and destroyed.

Ergo, Children are capable of true and reall Baptisme under the Gospel.

In this Argument, M. Marshall joyneth not with him at all.

Ans.

Ans^r. It is unlutterable, when it will seeke to prove a Conclusion true by two false Propositions.

First, the major is denyed: *All that were typically Baptized under the Law, are not capable of true baptisme under the Gospell.* For by the same reason, all the whole Congregation of *Israel* had beene capable of Baptisme in *Iohn Baptists* dayes.

Secondly, not onely the Congregation of *Israel*, but a mixed multitude went up with them, *Exod. 12. 38.*

But he reasoneth, that this was a Type of our Baptisme.

I answer, *In every type, as there is a similitude, so also there is some dissimilitude.*

Secondly, I deny that this was any type of Baptisme at all: and the Doctor cannot prove it.

Now to the minor, that children were typically baptized under the Law, is also denyed. For though they were in the Sea, (so were their Cattell) and though they were in the Cloud, yet not any were baptized unto Moses, but such as did understand the wonders of the Lord, even such as belceved the Lord, and his Servant Moses, *Exod. 14. 31.* For it is said, *They did all eate the same spirituall meat, and did all drinke the same spirituall*

rituall drinke: namely, they did all eat and
dinke Christ. Now Christ cannot be ea-
ten and drunk without beleeving: Both
the Propositions being thus false, we leave
the Conclusion altogether untrue.

ARGUMENT VII. pag. 49.

All they who belong to Christ, and his D. Feat-
Kingdome, ought to be reserved into the ly.
Church by Baptisme.

But children belong to Christ and his
Kingdome, as Christ himselfe teacheth us,
Mark. 10. 14. Luk. 10. 16. Suffer little
children to come unto me, and forbid them not,
for of such is the Kingdome of God. Verily,
I say unto you. Whosoever shall not receive the
Kingdome of God as a little child, he shall
not enter therein, vers. 15. And he tooke
them up in his armes, and put his hands
upon them, and blessed them.

Ergo, Children ought to be admitted into
the Church by Baptisme.

Suffer them to come unto me, and forbid M. Mar-
them not, because of such is the Kingdome of shall, pag.
God: That is my Church and Kingdome is 42.
made up of those, as well as of others.

I will answer this, and the following Ar-
guments, with more brivitie then I have
answered the former. And I doe deny the
major

major, or first Proposition, *viz.* *All that belong unto the Kingdome of Christ, ought not to be received into the Church by Baptisme.* A person may be said to belong to the Kingdome of Christ two wayes : first, by *Election*, which is secret : secondly, by *Calling*, which is manifest. Now the Ordinance of *Baptisme* belongeth not unto *Election*, but unto *Calling*.

Now M. *Marshals* dealing is observable, who sayth, that Christ sayth, his Church and Kingdome consisteth of such ; where he addeth the word *Church*, which Christ expresseth not : and therefore wee will charge him with addition of more unto the Text, then is found therein. And wee give him to understand, that many belong to the Kingdome of God, who doe not belong to the Church of God : And these Infants, whom our Saviour professeth by his divine knowledge to belong unto his Kingdome, yet you see, that he neyther baptized them, nor yet commanded them to be baptized ; although (I say) hee knew they belonged unto his Kingdome. With what fore-head dare you baptize Infants, when you know not whether they belong to the Kingdome of God, or no ?

ARGUMENT VIII,

*All they which receive the grace, both D. Feat-
 signified and exhibited to us in Baptisme, ly, pag.
 may and ought to receive the signe and Sa- 50.
 crament thereof. This is the Basis and foun-
 dation upon which S. Peter himselfe builds,
 Acts 10.47. Can any man forbid water, that
 these should not be baptized, who have recei-
 ved the Holy-Ghost as wel as we? And it may
 be further confirmed by an Argument drawne
 a majori ad minus, after this manner: If God
 bestow upon children that which is greater, the
 inward grace; why should we denie them the
 lesser, the outward elements? Or by an Argu-
 ment drawn a relatis: They to whom the Land
 is given, ought not to be denyed the sight and
 keeping of the Deeds and Evidences thereof;
 neither ought we to sever the things that God
 hath joyned, to wit, the signes and the things
 signified. They divide the signe from the thing
 signified, who denie them to have grace ordi-
 narily, modo non ponant obicem, who re-
 ceive the outward signe: And they againe se-
 ver the thing signified from the sign, who allow
 unto children the grace of remission of sinnes,
 and regeneration, and yet denie them the signe
 and seale thereof, to wit, Baptisme.*

*But, Children receive the grace sig-
 nified, and exhibited in Baptisme: For
 the*

the Apostle teacheth us, they are not uncleane, but holy; and therefore have remission of sinnes, and sanctification.

Ergo, Children ought to receive the signe and Sacrament thereof, to wit, Baptisme.

M. Mar-
shall, pag.
41.

To whom the inward grace of Baptisme doth belong, to them belongs the outward sign. They ought to have the signe, who have the thing signified: the earthly part of the Sacrament must be given unto them who have the heavenly part. But the Infants of Beleevers, even while they are Infants, are made partakers of the inward grace of Baptisme, of the heavenly and spirituall part, as growne men. Therefore they may, and ought to receive the outward signe of Baptisme.

I will Answer this deceitfull, and pudled and confounded Argument, by denyall of the major, and by laying downe in brieft certaine Propositions, to cleare, if it may be, that which is here so full of confusion.

1. Prop. That Children have the grace, mercy, and favour of God.

2. Prop. Children have not the knowledge of this grace and mercy.

3. Not they who have received grace and mercy: But they who have received manifestation of grace, ought to be Baptized.

4. That

4. That Peter, Acts 10. speaketh not onely of mercy and grace given, but also of mercy and grace manifested.

5. That neither Children, nor D. Fearly, nor M. Marshall, have yet received the gift whereof Peter speaks, Acts 10.

6. That Children may be holy in Gods imputation.

7. That Children are not holy in conscience and manifestation.

8. That in the sense whereof the Apostle spake, Children are not otherwise holy, then the unbelieving husband, who is sanctified, else were your Children uncleane, that is, ought to be put away: But now are they holy, you may remaine with them still. See M. Marshall, pag. 19. and Nehem. 13. 25. See Ezra 10. 3.

9. No unbeliever ought to bee Baptized, Acts 8. 36.

10. A child may have right to land, which may not keepe the Deeds.

11. A person may have the greater, to whom the lesser is denyed. Otherwise, why doe you deny the Supper to Children, who as you say, have the heavenly grace, and gift of the holy Ghost?

A R G U M E N T I X.

D. Feat- *All Apostolicall traditions, which are tra-*
 ly, p. 52. *ly such, ought to be had in reverent esteeme,*
and retained in the Church. For what the
Apostles delivered, they received from Christ
himselfe, either by word of mouth, or the
infallible inspiration of his Spirit. Such things
are part of that Sacrum depositum, which
Timothy is charged so deeply to keepe; O
Timothy, keep that which is committed un-
to thee: And the Thessalonians, to stand
fast and keepe Paradocis, word for word,
the traditions which you have beene taught,
either by word or by our Epistle. But the Bap-
tisme of children is an Apostolicall tradition,
truely so called.

Ergo, It ought to be had in high esteeme,
and retained in the Church.

M. Mar- *Origen saith, The Church received the*
 shall, pag. *tradition of Baptizing Infants from the Apo-*
 4. *stles; traditions being onely such things as are*
delivered from one to another, whether writ-
ten or unwritten.

Ans. What will you have? will you
bring us backe to unwritten traditions a-
gain? If your tradition be unwritten, why
doe you impose it upon us?

To

To prove that it is a Tradition, you alledge *Austin, Prosper, Jerom, Cyprian, Origen, &c.* And in the front of your Book, *Gregory Nazianzen.*

Unto the Testimony of *Gregory*, I shall answer in the first place; that in the place and words cited by your selfe, *Gregory* doth reſtaine it unto danger; ſaying, *If there be any danger*: But, what if there be no danger? then let them ſtay *TRIETIAN, &c.* three yeares (ſaith *Nazianzen*) leſſe or more, untill they be able to heare and answer.

And theſe words in the Author, doe immediately follow the place quoted by the Doctor. And he himſelfe confeſſed unto me, that he knew that this was the Authors opinion, that (time of danger excepted) Children ought not to be Baptized before they could heare and answer: And yet hath he with great fraud hidden this from the hearers. Judge, I pray you, whether this be Chriſtian dealing or not. And what was the cuſtome in thoſe dayes, whether to huddle with Children to the Font or no, may appeare by the example of *Nazianzen* himſelfe: His father was a Biſhop, his mother a vertuous women; fa-

mous in wonders, yet was not he himselfe Baptized untill thirtie yeares of age.

When he sayled unto *Athens*, (as I take it) being of perfect age, ΟΥΔΕΡΟΟ ΣΦΗΡΑΓΙΣΤΗΣΙΣ ΒΑΠΤΙΣΜΑΤΙ, he was not yet sealed with Baptisme. And in the story of his life, it is said, ΤΡΙΑΚΟΣΤΟΝ ΕΤΟΣ, &c. He was Baptized when he was full thirtie yeares of age: either then the father of *Gregory*, and his mother, did not know this Tradition, or else they did wilfully transgresse it. But against the Authorities brought, I shall alledge one, who is more ancient then any that they can truly cite: (For *Justin Martyr* is fraudulently cited by *M. Marshall*, his owne Conscience perswading him, that it was not *Justins* Booke which goes under his name, as appeares in *M. Marshall*, pag. 3.) *Tertullian* is the man, who in the latter end of his Sermon concerning Baptisme, disputes who are to be Baptized, and determines it thus: *Omni percontati dato*, give to every one that asketh it. *Acate cunctatus Baptismi utilior*, &c. The deferring of Baptisme, is more profitable in age; but especially concerning children: of whom he saith, *Fiant Christiani cum Christum nosse poterint*: Let them be made Christi-

ains when they are able to know Christ ;
 with many such like things in the same
 place : one whereof I cannot forget, *Quid*
enim necesse esse (si non tam necesse est) spon-
sos, etiam periculo, ingeri? What need
 is there for Godfathers to be brought in, in
 the time of danger? Where he concludes,
 that Infants have no need of Baptisme. But
 one thing I may not passe by, viz. That
 those words (*Si non tam necesse*) are con-
 fessed to be added to the Author by the
 Commentator, that he might mitigate the
 Authors opinion concerning *Baptisme of*
Infants. When I looke upon this dealing,
 and consider what the Doctor hath done
 in the citation of *Nazianzen*, I have
 cause to say; as did your Fathers, so doe
 yee:

For the authoritie of *Austin*: I answer,
 that *Ludovicus Vives*, a man well skil'd in
Austin, beleev'd no such matter: for in his
 Annotations upon the 27 chap. of the first
 Book *De Civ. Dei*, he hath these words, *Olim*
neminem consuevisse Baptizari, &c. That of old
 it was the custome to baptize none unlesse they
 were of full age, & did desire Baptisme in their
 owne persons, and did understand what it
 was to be Baptized: And Cardinall *Bellar-*
mine confesseth, that *Erasmus* was of the
 F 3 same

same mind. What becomes of your Apostolicall tradition?

ARGUMENT X.

*D. Feat-
ly, p. 53.*

All members of the Reformed Protestant Churches in Christendome, ought to conform their judgements to the harmony of the Protestant Confessions, set forth by the consent of a'l Orthodox Churches, and firmly grounded upon Deductions, at least of holy Scripture, if not evident Texts.

But the judgement of all the Reformed Churches, delivered in the harmony of their Confessions, is professedly for the Baptisme of Infants, and expressely against this tenet of the Anabaptists.

Ergo, Let the Anabaptists with it, Disclaime the name of Protestants, and Children of the Reformed Churches, or renounce this their Heresie: For, Turpis pars qua non congruit toti.

A sw. O man full of Subtiltie! How long will you labour to deceive? You have left out some words inserted in your major, viz. firmly grounded upon holy Scripture: Wee grant, that these Confessions by you cited, doe seeke to establish Baptisme of Infants: But that these confessions are in this poynt grounded upon
Scrip-

Scripture, is the thing we deny. And this is that we doe professe, that wheresoever the Protestant Confessions doe goe hand in hand with holy Scripture, we doe rejoyce to follow them. But if they have swerved from the line, their example must not be our president: for we have a more sure word of prophesie, whereunto yee doe well that yee take heed, as unto a light shining in a darke place, untill the day dawne, and the day-starre appeare in your hearts, 2 *Pet.* 1. 19. I answer againe, as Cardinall *Bellarmino* well and truly observeth: The Protestants do confesse the Baptisme of Infants with the mouth; but yet the whole course of their own positions do indeed overthrow it. And I can prove, that the Church of *England*, in maintaining the Baptisme of Infants, swerveth from her owne principles. But I will goe no farther at this time; onely I shall intreat the Lord to open the eyes of those that in this poynt cannot yet see: that they may consider with understanding what hath beene written.

F I N I S.